DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 899 TM 024 181

AUTHOR	Wesley, Scott
TITLE	Job Analysis of the Knowledge Important for Newly Licensed Teachers of English. The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers.
INSTITUTION	Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO	ETS-RR-93-24
PUB DATE	Apr 93
NOTE	72p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrators; *Beginning Teachers; College Faculty; Criteria; Cutting Scores; English Instruction; *English Teachers; Higher Education; *Job Analysis; *Knowledge Base for Teaching; Licensing Examinations (Professions); National Surveys; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS	*Praxis Series; Subject Content Knowledge; Test Specifications

ABSTRACT

A job analysis was conducted to define the knowledge domain in which newly licensed (certified) English teachers must be knowledgeable to perform competently. The results of the job analysis were to be used to develop test specifications for the Subject Assessment in English of the Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers. A draft version of 94 knowledge statements in 3 major content areas was prepared by the Educational Testing Service and submitted to 11 subject-matter experts. Their revisions were reviewed by an Advisory Committee, resulting in an inventory of 110 knowledge statements grouped into the 4 categories of literature, language and linguistics, rhetoric and composition, and pedagogy specific to English. The revised domain was subjected to verification and refutation through a national survey of 510 teachers, 259 college faculty, and 52 school administrators. A follow-up study with an additional 350 educators focused on relatively new teachers. A cut point was established for inclusion in the final domain. In all, 19 of the 110 statements did not meet the 2.50 criterion for inclusion in establishing test specifications. Seven appendixes, with three appendix tables, provide supplemental information about the study, including the survey questionnaire. (Contains 6 tables and 14 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 899

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

Job Analysis of the Knowledge Important for Newly Licensed Teachers of English

Scott Wesley

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. I. BRAUN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

April 1993

RR. 93-24

TM024181

ETS Educational Testing Service

Copyright © 1993 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank several people who provided assistance during this study. Mimi Levin and Kathy Bradley of Educational Testing Service (ETS) School and Higher Education Programs did a wonderful job developing the initial draft of the English content domain. They were also responsible for identifying and contacting external subject matter experts to review the draft content domain. I would also like to thank the members of the External Review Panel and the Advisory Committee for their significant contributions to the study. My gratitude also extends to Richard Tannenbaum and Mike Rosenfeld of ETS for their useful feedback and Anne Reynolds, also of ETS, for her development of a framework for content-specific pedagogy. Many thanks to Diane Wattay and Cindy Hammell of ETS for assisting in the development of this report. I would like to thank the representatives of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), NCTE Black Caucus, NCTE Hispanic Caucus, and the College Language Association for providing the mailing lists for the job analysis. Lastly, I want to thank the several hundred teachers, college faculty, and administrators who took time away from their busy schedules to complete and return the survey.

Executive Summary

A job analysis was conducted to define the content domain in which newly licensed (certified) English teachers must be knowledgeable to perform their jobs in a competent manner. The results of the job analysis will be used to develop test specifications for the Subject Assessment in English of the Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™.

A draft domain of knowledge statements was constructed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) Test Development staff with subject-matter expertise in English and ETS Research staff with expertise in job analysis methodology. In the process of developing the draft domain, ETS subject-matter experts reviewed previous National Teacher Examination (NTE) English test specifications, state licensure (certification) requirements, and relevant professional literature. The resultant draft domain consisted of three major content areas and 94 knowledge statements. The three major content areas were: (1) Literature, (2) Language and Composition, and (3) Content-Specific Pedagogy.

This draft domain was then reviewed by an External Review Panel of 11 subject-matter experts: 3 classroom teachers and 8 college faculty. The panel reviewed the draft domain for (1) the appropriateness of its overall structure and (2) the appropriateness of the specific statements and their completeness and clarity. Revisions suggested by the panel, including additions and deletions of content areas and knowledge statements, were obtained via a telephone interview conducted by ETS Research staff. Wording changes were made to the draft domain and some additional statements were included. The revised domain consisted of 116 statements.

This revised draft domain was then reviewed by an Advisory Committee. This committee was comprised of four secondary school English teachers, three college faculty, and one school administrator. This committee was charged with modifying the revised draft domain so that it accurately reflected what the members of the committee believed were the knowledge areas important for newly licensed (certified) English teachers. This modification process occurred during a four-day meeting held at ETS. The committee made numerous changes to the job analysis inventory, including changes to the knowledge statements themselves, changes to the category headings and directions, and changes to the title in the interest of rendering the inventory more appropriate and comprehensive and its statements unambiguous. The final form of the job analysis inventory comprises 110 knowledge statements grouped into four categories: (1) Literature, (2) Language/Linguistics, (3) Rhetoric/Composition, and (4) Pedagogy Specific to English.

This revised domain was then subjected to verification/refutation through a national survey of 510 teachers (approximately 10 per state and 10 from the District of Columbia), 259 college faculty (approximately 5 per state 5 from the District of Columbia), and 52 school administrators (approximately 1 per state and 1 from the District of Columbia) for a total of 821 education professionals. The mailing list was made up of names from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) membership roster so that appropriate people could be reached. Names from the roster were drawn at random in a way that satisfied the state participation requirements stated above.

We later sent the survey to an additional 350 education professionals. In this supplemental sample we attempted to focus on individuals who were relatively new to the teaching profession (e.g., less than five years teaching experience) and to bolster minority representation. We did this to increase the likelihood that a sufficient number of responses from new teachers and minorities would be available for analysis. Of the 350, a minority sample of 175 was obtained from the NCTE Black Caucus, NCTE Hispanic Caucus, and the College Language Association. Also, a sample of 175 new English teachers was obtained from Market Data Retrieval (MDR), an educational mailing list company.

The survey participants were asked to rate the statements in terms of their importance for newly licensed (certified) English teachers to perform their jobs in a competent manner. The 5-point rating scale ranged from 0 (of no importance) to 4 (very important). The purpose of the survey administration was to identify a core of knowledge statements that relatively large numbers of education professionals verified to be important to newly licensed (certified) English teachers. The latter objective is accomplished through the analysis of the mean importance ratings provided by four groups of education professionals (i.e., teachers and college faculty in both primary and supplemental samples) and by appropriate subgroups of respondents (sex, race/ethnicity, geographic region, teaching experience) in the combined sample. Statements that are judged to be important by *all* respondent groups and subgroups define the core. The core becomes the primary data base for the development of test specifications. The derivation of test specifications from those tasks verified to be important by the surveyed education professionals provides a substantial evidential basis for the content validity (content relevance) of The Praxis II Subject Assessment in English.

Two types of data analysis were conducted to support the development of content valid (content relevant) test specifications for the Subject Assessment in English: (1) means were computed of the importance ratings for each knowledge statement by the four groups of education professionals and by the appropriate subgroups of respondents; and (2) correlations of the profiles of these mean importance ratings were computed across the four groups of education professionals and within the appropriate subgroups of respondents.

A cut point of a mean importance rating of 2.50 (the midpoint between moderately important [scale value 2] and important [scale value 3]) was established to identify the core of important statements. Statements that were judged by both groups of education professionals and all subgroups of respondents to be 2.50 or higher comprised the core and therefore were considered eligible for inclusion in the development of test specifications. (However, because the survey participants were not involved in the development of the knowledge domain, they may lack certain insights that the Advisory Committee members have because of their high level of involvement in the definition of the domain. As a consequence, if the committee believes that a knowledge statement rated below 2.50 should be included in the specifications and the committee can provide *compelling written rationales*, those knowledge statements may be reinstated for inclusion in the test specifications.)

The results of the mean analysis conducted by teachers and college faculty (primary and supplemental samples) showed that 18 statements were rated less than 2.50. This represents 16.4% of the content domain. In the subgroup analyses, 17 (15.5%) statements were rated below 2.50. *In total, 19 of the 110 statements (17.3%) did not meet the 2.50 criterion for inclusion.* All of the statements were in the knowledge categories of Literature and Language/Linguistics.

All statements in the Rhetoric and Composition and Pedagogy Specific to English categories were verified by the surveyed subgroups.

The computation of correlation coefficients to assess agreement in terms of perceived relative importance of the knowledge statements revealed a very high level of agreement. The coefficients for comparisons among the teachers and college faculty all exceeded .85. Coefficients generated during the demographic subgroup analyses all exceeded .95. These findings indicate that *there is substantial agreement on the relative importance given to the statements by a diverse group of education professionals.*

The 91 knowledge statements that were verified to be important by the surveyed teachers, the college faculty, and the demographic subgroups should be used as the foundation for the development of test specifications. Test specifications that are linked to the results of a job analysis provide support for the content validity of the derived assessment measures and may be seen as part of an initial step in ensuring the fairness to subgroups of English teacher candidates of the derived assessment measures. It is reasonable to assume that, due to testing and psychometric constraints (e.g., time limits, ability to measure some content reliably), not all of the verified content will be included in the assessment measures. One source of information that may be used to guide the Advisory Committee in their decision as to what verified content to include in the assessment measure is the mean importance rating. Although a rank ordering of the content by mean importance rating is not implied, it is recommended that initial consideration be given to content that is well above the cut point and represents the appropriate breadth of content coverage.

Evidence was also provided in this study of the comprehensiveness of the content domain within the four major content areas. This information has implications for the adequacy of the content domain. If the domain was adequately defined, then the categories should be judged to have been well covered by their accompanying statements. The results supported the adequacy of the defined content domain.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	i
Executive Summary	ii
List of Tables	vii
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing	1
Job Analysis	2
Objectives of the Job Analysis Study	2
Methods	2
Definition of the Knowledge Domain	3
Development of a Draft Knowledge Domain	3
Evaluation of Draft Domain by External Review Panel	3
Advisory Committee Meeting	4
Pilot Test of the Job Analysis Inventory	5
Large-Scale Survey	5
Survey Instrument	5
Survey Participants	5
Survey Administration	6
Results	6
Survey Respondents: Primary Sample	6
Response Rate	6
Demographic Characteristics	6
Survey Respondents: Supplemental Sample	7
Response Rate	7
Demographic Characteristics	7
Analysis of Importance Ratings	7
Means	7
Correlations	8

Criterion for Interpretation of Mean Importance Ratings 8
Mean Importance Ratings 8
Education Professionals 8
Demographic Subgroups 11
Correlations of the Profiles of Mean Importance Ratings 11
Education Professionals 11
Demographic Subgroups 11
Mean Ratings of Content Coverage 11
Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis: Recommendations for Test Content 12
Summary and Conclusions 13
References 15

Appendix A: External Review Panel A1
Appendix B: Advisory Committee B1
Appendix C: Job Analysis Inventory C1
Appendix D: Cover Letter and Follow-Up Post Card D1
Appendix E: Demographic Distributions E1
Appendix F: Importance Ratings for Primary and Supplemental Samples F1
Appendix G: Importance Ratings for Demographic Subgroups G1

List of Tables

		Page
Table 1:	Statements Rated Below 2.50 by Teachers and College Faculty	9
Table 2:	Statements Rated Below 2.50 by Demographic Subgroups	10
Table 3:	Correlations of the Mean Importance Ratings Among Education Professionals	11
Table 4:	Correlations of the Mean Importance Ratings among Demographic Subgroups	12
Table 5:	Mean Ratings of Content Coverage	12
Table 6:	Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis	13

Introduction

Purpose of the Study

The subject assessments for The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™ are designed to assess a prospective teacher's content knowledge of a specific subject area and subject-specific pedagogical knowledge. The focus of such tests is based on the premise that beginning teachers should demonstrate knowledge of the subjects they intend to teach (Grossman, Wilson, & Shulman, 1989) and, perhaps, demonstrate knowledge of teaching principles, strategies, and resources specific to those subjects (Grossman, 1989; McDiarmid, Ball, & Anderson, 1989; Reynolds, 1992). The Praxis Series can be used by state agencies as one of several criteria for initial teacher licensure (certification). Included as part of the subject assessments is a licensure examination for English teachers. To identify the content domain of this examination and to support the content validity (content relevance) of this examination, a job analysis was conducted of the knowledge important for newly licensed (beginning) English teachers. This report will describe the job analysis study. In particular, it will provide the rationale for conducting the job analysis, present the methods used to define job-related knowledge, describe the types of statistical analysis conducted, report the results of these analyses, and specify the implications for developing test specifications.

Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing

The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (1985) is a comprehensive technical guide that provides criteria for the evaluation of tests, testing practices, and the effects of test use. It was developed jointly by the American Psychological Association (APA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). The guidelines presented in the *Standards* have, by professional consensus, come to define the necessary components of quality testing. As a consequence, a testing program that adheres to the *Standards* is more likely to be judged to be valid (defensible) than one that does not.

There are two categories of criteria within the *Standards*, primary and secondary. Those classified as primary "should be met by all tests . . . unless a sound professional reason is available to show why it is not necessary, or technically feasible, to do so in a particular case. Test developers and users . . . are expected to be able to explain why any primary standards have not been met" (AERA/APA/NCME, 1985, p. 2). One of the primary standards is that the content domain of a licensure or certification test should be defined in terms of the importance of the content for competent performance in an occupation. "Job analyses provide the primary basis for defining the content domain." (p. 64).

The use of job analysis to define the content domain is a critical component in establishing the content validity of licensure and certification examinations. Content validity is the primary validation strategy used for these examinations. It refers to the extent to which the content covered by an examination overlaps with the important components (tasks, knowledge, skills, or abilities) of a job (Arvey & Faley, 1988). Demonstration of content validity is accomplished through the judgments of subject-matter experts. It is enhanced by the inclusion of large numbers of subject-matter experts who represent the diversity of the relevant areas of expertise

(Ghiselli, Campbell, & Zedeck, 1981). The lack of a well-designed job analysis is frequently cited (by the courts) as a major cause of test invalidity.

Job Analysis

Job analysis refers to procedures designed to obtain descriptive information about the tasks performed on a job and/or the knowledge, skills, and abilities thought necessary to adequately perform those tasks (Gael, 1983). The specific type of job information collected for a job analysis is determined by the purpose for which the information will be used. For purposes of developing licensure and certification examinations, a job analysis should identify the *important knowledge or abilities necessary to protect the public* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1985). In addition, a well-designed job analysis should include the participation of various subject-matter experts (Mehrens, 1987); and the data collected should be representative of the diversity within the job. Diversity refers to regional or job context factors and to subject-matter-expert factors such as race/ethnicity, experience, and sex (Kuehn, Stallings, & Holland, 1990). The job analysis conducted for English teachers was designed to follow the guidelines presented in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* and to adhere to accepted professional practice.

Objectives of the Job Analysis Study

The objectives of this study were: (1) to construct a comprehensive domain of knowledge that is important for newly licensed (certified) English teachers and then (2) to obtain, using survey methodology, the independent judgments of a national sample of English education professionals (teachers, college faculty, and state administrators) to verify or refute the importance of the domain of knowledge. The verification/refutation component plays a critical part in ensuring that the domain (in whole or in part) is judged to be relevant to the job of a newly licensed (certified) English teacher by a diversity of education professionals. The components of the domain that are verified will be used in the development of test specifications for The Praxis II Subject Assessment in English.

Methods

The job analysis study described in this report involved a multi-method approach that included subject-matter experts and a national survey. First, groups of subject-matter experts defined a knowledge domain important for newly licensed/certified English teachers. A description of this knowledge domain was then sent out to education professionals through a large-scale national survey. The purpose of the survey administration was to obtain verification and/or refutation from large numbers of education professionals that the previous groups of subject-matter experts had defined as a domain of knowledge important for newly licensed English teachers. Through this process we can identify a core of important knowledge that is related to the job of the newly licensed English teacher. The survey functions as a "check and balance" on the judgments of the subject-matter experts and reduces the likelihood that unimportant knowledge areas will be included in the development of the test specifications. The use of a job analysis survey is also an efficient and cost-effective method of obtaining input from large numbers of subject-matter experts and makes it possible for ratings to be analyzed separately by appropriate subgroups.

The survey participants were English teachers, administrators, and college faculty whose names were obtained from the membership of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). An additional list of new English teachers was obtained from Market Data Retrieval (MDR), an education mailing list company. Also, a minority sample was obtained from the NCTE Black Caucus, NCTE Hispanic Caucus, and the College Language Association. The participants were asked to rate the job analysis task statements in terms of their *importance* for newly licensed/certified English teachers to perform their jobs in a competent manner. The specific steps in the job analysis process are described below.

Definition of the Knowledge Domain

Development of a draft knowledge domain. The first step in the process of conducting the job analysis was to construct a preliminary knowledge domain. The domain was constructed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) Test Development staff who have subject-matter expertise in English and ETS Research staff with expertise in job analysis methodology. In the process of developing the draft, the ETS subject-matter experts reviewed state licensure (certification) requirements, previous National Teacher Examination (NTE) English test specifications, current test items, and relevant professional literature.

The resultant draft domain consisted of three major content areas: (1) Literature, (2) Language and Composition, and (3) Content-Specific Pedagogy. Within each category were several knowledge statements mapping the important aspects of the category. These statements were presented in behavioral terms (e.g., *describe the writer's tone in a passage; provide and sustain a focus or thesis*). This draft included a total of 94 statements for the three categories.

Evaluation of draft domain by External Review Panel. Consistent with a content validity framework, the job analysis study was designed to obtain input from many subject-matter experts at several critical points in the domain definition process. To this end, an External Review Panel of 11 English education professionals was formed to review the draft domain. This group consisted of three classroom teachers and eight college faculty. Individuals were considered for membership through a process of peer recommendation. All of the review panelists have experience either teaching English or supervising teachers of English. Generally, they are prominent and active in professional associations and/or teacher licensure. In addition to their subject-matter expertise, the panel was formed so as to have representation by sex, ethnicity, and geographic location. Members of the panel are listed in Appendix A.

The panelists were instructed to review the draft and to make modifications they felt were necessary to adequately cover the important aspects of teaching English. They were further instructed that these modifications could include the addition of important knowledge statements, deletion of unimportant statements, elaboration of statements with relevant examples, and revision of statements into language that is clear and appropriate for individuals in English education. The panelists were interviewed via telephone by ETS Research staff to obtain their suggestions for modification.

Information from the interviews was compiled, discussed with ETS Test Development Staff, and, subsequently, used to revise the draft. Wording changes were made to the draft, and some additional statements were included. The revised draft consisted of 116 statements.

Advisory Committee meeting. The next step in the job analysis process was a meeting held January 18-21, 1990, in Princeton, New Jersey with an Advisory Committee of eight subject-matter specialists. The committee was charged with developing a final version of the job analysis inventory and with developing the specifications for the new test. Like the External Review Panelists, members of the advisory committee have documented knowledge of the subject matter. The committee comprises four classroom teachers, three college faculty members, and one school administrator and has representation by sex, ethnicity, and geographic location. Members of the committee are listed in Appendix B.

The meeting was led jointly by ETS Test Development and Research staff. Prior to the meeting, committee members were mailed a copy of the draft domain to review. They were informed about the purpose of the meeting and asked to come prepared to discuss their review. Because they will use the results obtained from a survey administration of the content domain, it is critical that committee members have a clear understanding of each statement. The group interaction during the meeting fostered discussions that generated suggestions not made during the individual interviews with the External Review Panelists. The committee members attempted to be inclusive (i.e., cover all important aspects of teaching the subject matter) rather than exclusive in defining the content domain.

The committee made numerous changes to the Job Analysis Inventory, including changes to the knowledge statements themselves, changes to the category headings and directions, and changes to the title in the interest of rendering the inventory more appropriate and comprehensive and its statements unambiguous. Although the knowledge statements themselves evoked considerable discussion, the greatest discussion centered on the categorization of the knowledge statements. The committee found it difficult to avoid overlap among the different categories and to differentiate between skills the newly licensed teacher should be equipped with to teach and skills the experienced teacher should possess. Ultimately, after the committee had decided to shelve the discussion for a time, committee member Janice Lauer proposed a scheme that, with some minor revisions, dealt with the majority of the committee's concerns. The final form of the Job Analysis Inventory comprises 110 knowledge statements grouped into four categories; (1) Literature, (2) Language/Linguistics, (3) Rhetoric/Composition, and (4) Pedagogy Specific to English.

During the meeting, the Advisory Committee also reviewed and approved the proposed rating scale for the inventory. The rating scale required respondents to make judgments regarding importance to the newly licensed teacher. The importance scale, which is shown below, is in compliance with professional standards (cf. AERA, APA, & NCME, 1985).

> How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?
>
> (0) Of no importance
> (1) Of little importance
> (2) Moderately important
> (3) Important
> (4) Very important

The committee also reviewed and approved items concerning demographic and background information (e.g., sex, teaching experience, geographic location). Such items were included so

that we could describe the composition of the survey respondent group and conduct analyses of the survey responses by various subgroups of respondents (e.g., males and females).

Pilot test of the Job Analysis Inventory. After the meeting, a revised Job Analysis Inventory was mailed to the committee members for final approval. Once approval was obtained, the inventory was pilot tested on a group of eight classroom teachers. The pilot participants were asked to review the survey for clarity of wording, ease of use, and comprehensiveness of content coverage. The pilot test indicated that no one had difficulty completing the inventory and that no additional changes were necessary.

Large-Scale Survey

Survey instrument. The finalized survey consisted of three parts. Part I included four major knowledge categories: Literature, Language/Linguistics, Rhetoric/Composition, and Pedagogy Specific to English. Under these categories were 110 specific knowledge statements. Survey respondents were asked to rate the statements using the importance scale shown above.

For each major knowledge category there was also a content coverage question in Part I. Survey participants were asked to indicate how well each major knowledge category was covered by its knowledge statements. Respondents made their judgments using a 5-point rating scale (1 = Poorly, 2 = Somewhat, 3 = Adequately, 4 = Well, 5 = Very well). The participants also had an opportunity to identify and write in knowledge statements that they believed should be added to the domain.

In Part II of the survey participants were asked to indicate the weight (emphasis) that each of the major knowledge categories should receive on the assessment. This was accomplished by distributing 100 total points across the major areas. These point distributions were converted into percentages, representing the percent of items that the survey respondents believed should be devoted to each area.

In Part III participants were asked for demographic and background information. As previously noted, these items are used to describe the respondents and to perform subgroup analyses. A copy of the final survey is provided in Appendix C.

Survey participants. The primary sample for this study consisted of 510 teachers (approximately 10 per state and the 10 from the District of Columbia), 259 college faculty (approximately 5 per state and 5 from the District of Columbia), and 52 school administrators (approximately 1 per state and 1 from the District of Columbia) for a total of 821 education professionals (approximately 16 per state). The mailing list was made up of names from the NCTE membership roster so that appropriate people could be reached. Names from the roster were drawn at random in such a way as to satisfy the state participation requirements noted above.

We later sent the survey to an additional 350 education professionals. In this supplemental sample we attempted to focus on individuals who were relatively new to the teaching profession (e.g., less than five years teaching experience) and to bolster minority representation. We did this to increase the likelihood that a sufficient number of responses from new teachers and minorities would be available for analysis. Of the 350, a minority sample of 175 was obtained

from the NCTE Black Caucus, NCTE Hispanic Caucus, and the College Language Association. Also, a sample of 175 English teachers was obtained from Market Data Retrieval (MDR), an educational mailing list company. MDR was unable to specifically identify 175 new teachers, but, as a surrogate strategy, was able to identify teachers who were new to their schools.

Survey administration. The surveys were administered to the primary sample in May 1990. Surveys were administered to the supplemental sample in August 1991. Each survey was accompanied by a letter of invitation to participate and a postage-paid envelope for return of the completed survey. A reminder postcard was mailed approximately one week after the survey mailing. The cover letters for the main and supplemental samples and the follow-up postcard are provided in Appendix D.

The purpose of the survey administration was to identify a core of knowledge statements that relatively large numbers of education professionals judged to be relevant (verified as important) to newly licensed (certified) English teachers. The latter objective is accomplished through an analysis of the mean importance ratings provided by the four groups of education professionals and by the appropriate subgroups of respondents. Knowledge statements that are judged to be important by *all* respondent groups and subgroups define the core. The core becomes the primary data base for the development of test specifications. The derivation of test specifications from those knowledge statements verified as important by the surveyed education professionals provides a substantial evidential basis for the content validity (content relevance) of the Subject Assessment in English.

Results

Survey Respondents: Primary Sample

Response rate. Of the 821 inventories mailed, 7 were returned incomplete for a variety of reasons (e.g., wrong address, individual was retired and declined to participate). Of the remaining 814, 507 (62.3%) were completed and returned.

Demographic characteristics. Results of the analyses of the responses to the demographic questions in the inventory are summarized in Appendix E. The typical respondent was over 35 years old, White, had at least a master's degree, and had more than 16 years of experience in teaching English. More of the respondents were female than were male (70.2% to 28.0%). The respondents who taught tended to do so in high school (grades 9-12) or in college.

Survey Respondents: Supplemental Sample

Response Rate. Of the 350 inventories mailed to the supplemental sample, 5 were returned incomplete. Of the remaining 345, 217 (62.9%) were completed and returned.

Demographic Characteristics. Demographic distributions for this sample are provided in Appendix E. As intended, most of the respondents were teachers (118/217 = 54.4%). Of the respondents, 18.5% (40/217) had 5 or fewer years of teaching experience; 51.7% of the

respondents reported being from racial and ethnic minority groups. Hence, the sampling strategy was partially successful. In addition to teaching experience, this sample was different from the primary sample on other demographic variables. For example, the supplemental sample tended to be younger, had a higher percentage of women and minority respondents, and had fewer respondents with a master's degree than the primary sample.

Analysis of Importance Ratings

Two types of data analysis were conducted to support the development of content valid (content relevant) test specifications for the Subject Assessment in English: (1) Means were computed of the importance ratings for each knowledge statement by the three groups of education professionals and by the appropriate subgroups of respondents, and (2) correlations of the profiles of these mean importance ratings were computed across the three groups of education professionals and the appropriate subgroups of respondents.

Means. The mean analysis is used to determine the level (absolute value) of importance attributed to the knowledge statements. Means were computed for teachers and college faculty in the primary sample and teachers in the supplemental sample. Means were also computed for appropriate subgroups of respondents in the two samples combined (sex, race/ethnicity, geographic region, teaching experience). An analysis of importance ratings by geographic region is consistent with the recent legal emphasis on addressing regional job variability when conducting job analyses for content domain specification purposes (Kuehn et al., 1990). We used the regional categorizations established by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) in our analysis. Sex and race/ethnicity subgroups were included because they represent protected "classes" under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We used a dichotomous breakdown of teaching experience at the 5-year point so that the judgments of less experienced teachers and more experienced teachers could be represented separately.

A respondent category was required to have at least 30 respondents to be included in the mean analysis (e.g., $\geq$ 30 college faculty, $\geq$ 30 females). This is a necessary condition to ensure that the mean value based upon the sample of respondents is an accurate estimate of the corresponding population mean value (Walpole, 1974). Consequently, there were insufficient numbers of state administrators to analyze their responses separately. Knowledge statements that meet or exceed a mean importance value of 2.50 (to be discussed in a later section) by *all four groups of education professionals* (teachers and college faculty in the primary and supplemental samples) and by *all subgroups of respondents* may be included in the development of the test specifications. In addition, mean ratings were computed for the responses to the content coverage section and the recommendation for test content section of the job analysis survey. These analyses were computed for the four groups of educational professionals and for the total sample.

Correlations. The correlational analysis is used to determine the extent of agreement among the four groups of education professionals and among the demographic subgroups of respondents about the relative importance of the knowledge statements. Relative importance refers to the similarity of the pattern of mean ratings generated by the different respondent groups. For example, the profile of 110 mean ratings for teachers in the primary sample is correlated with the profile of 110 mean ratings for teachers in the supplemental sample. If these

two profiles are similar (the shapes of the profiles are complementary), the value of the correlation coefficient will be close to 1.00.

Criterion for Interpretation of Mean Importance Ratings

Since the purpose of a job analysis is to ensure that only the most important knowledge statements are included in the development of test specifications, a criterion (cut point) for inclusion needs to be established. A criterion that has been used in a similar study (Rosenfeld & Tannenbaum, 1991) is a mean importance rating that represents the midpoint between moderately important and the next higher scale value. For the importance rating scale used in the present job analysis, the value of this criterion is 2.50 (midpoint between moderately important and important). It is believed that this criterion is consistent with the intent of content validity, which is to measure only important knowledge in the assessment measure. Therefore, knowledge statements that receive a mean importance rating of 2.50 or more may be considered eligible for inclusion in the development of test specifications; knowledge statements that receive a mean rating of less than 2.50 may not be considered for inclusion. (Because survey participants were not involved in the development of the content domain, however, they may lack certain insights that the Advisory Committee members have because of their high level of involvement in the definition of the domain. Consequently, if the committee believes that a knowledge statement rated below 2.50 should be included in the specifications and the committee can provide *compelling written rationales*, those knowledge statements may be reinstated for inclusion in the test specifications.)

Mean Importance Ratings

Education professionals. Means and standard deviations were computed for teachers and college faculty in the primary and supplemental samples. Because of their length, these data are provided in Appendix F.

Those knowledge statements rated less than 2.50 by either the teachers or college faculty in the primary or supplemental samples are provided in Table 1. Of the 110 individual knowledge statements, 18 (16.4%) were rated below 2.50 by one or more of the four groups. The 18 statements with low ratings were confined to the two major categories of Literature and Language/Linguistics. Hence, all statements in the Rhetoric/Composition and Pedagogy Specific to English categories were approved by the education professionals.

Demographic subgroups. Means were computed for demographic subgroups based on sex, race/ethnicity, geographic region, and teaching experience. These data are presented in a table in Appendix G.

Those knowledge statements rated less than 2.50 by any of the demographic subgroups are provided in Table 2. Of the 110 individual knowledge statements, 17 (15.5%) were rated below 2.50 by one or more of the subgroups. Again, all the items rated below 2.50 were confined to the Literature and Language/Linguistics categories.

Table 1
Statements Rated Below 2.50 by Teachers and College Faculty

	Primary Sample		Supplemental Sample	
	Teachers (N=219)	College Faculty (N=165)	Teachers (N=118)	College Faculty (N=64)
LITERATURE				
17 Identify meters and rhyme schemes	2.42	2.09	2.26	2.31
19 Demonstrate understanding of poststructuralist literary theory	1.41	1.78	1.55	1.85
20 Demonstrate understanding of film as literature	2.31	2.35	2.44	2.43
Identify major works from the following categories, given brief literary passages or critical commentary:				
22 World literature		2.47		
23 Classical literature		2.42		
24 Comparative literature	2.35	2.12	2.43	2.44
25 English literature to 1660	2.49	2.35	2.49	
29 Adolescent literature	2.47	2.43	2.49	
31 Women's literature	2.47			
32 Literary theory	2.18	2.01	2.17	
LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS				
Demonstrate an understanding of the following:				
34 History of the English language	2.48		2.30	
35 Theories of language acquisition and development	2.12		2.07	
36 Inflection/morphology	1.88	2.00	1.82	2.39
37 Dialects	2.14		2.14	
38 Phonology	1.88	1.87	1.87	
39 Psycholinguistics	1.63	2.25	1.70	2.49
41 Sociolinguistics	1.93		2.04	
44 Other grammatical theories	2.25	2.44	2.38	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Statements Rated Below 2.50 by Demographic Subgroups

	Sex		Race/ Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Teaching Experience (teachers only)	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	< 5	6+
LITERATURE										
17 Identify meters and rhyme schemes	2.36	2.27	2.38	2.32	2.35	2.32	2.40	2.26	2.17	2.39
19 Demonstrate understanding of poststructuralist literary theory	1.61	1.65	1.84	1.57	1.58	1.69	1.57	1.67	1.54	1.45
20 Demonstrate understanding of film as literature	2.38	2.32	2.49	2.33	2.47	2.35	2.29	2.39	2.35	2.35
Identify major works from the following categories, given brief literary passages or critical commentary:										
24 Comparative literature	2.34	2.35		2.28	2.37	2.36	2.34	2.33		2.35
25 English literature to 1660	2.47			2.46	2.43			2.32		2.47
29 Adolescent literature		2.46		2.48				2.45		2.45
31 Women's literature				2.49						2.46
32 Literary theory	2.22	2.13		2.12	2.18	2.28	2.18	2.16	2.34	2.15
LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS										
Demonstrate an understanding of the following:										
34 History of the English language					2.47			2.45	2.23	2.44
35 Theories of language acquisition and development	2.37			2.39	2.40	2.46		2.48	2.10	2.10
36 Inflection/morphology	1.98	2.13	2.46	1.91	2.00	2.06	2.12	1.87	1.70	1.88
37 Dialects	2.35	2.49		2.27	2.36	2.49	2.43	2.26	2.30	2.12
38 Phonology	1.98	1.99	2.47	1.86	1.96	2.01	2.08	1.88	1.90	1.88
39 Psycholinguistics	1.93	1.99	2.39	1.85	1.95	2.02	1.90	1.94	1.73	1.64
40 Semantics								2.41	2.45	
41 Sociolinguistics	2.24	2.42		2.16	2.31	2.36	2.22	2.29	2.05	1.96
44 Other grammatical theories	2.38	2.43		2.32	2.41	2.42	2.36	2.37	2.33	2.29

Note: **F = Female (N=516); M = Male (N=197); POC = People of Color (N=141); W = White (N=568); NE = Northeast (N=168); C = Central (N=171); S = South (N=187); FW = Far West (N=173); 0-5 = 0 to 5 years' teaching experience (N=41); 6+ = 6 or more years' teaching experience (N=296).**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Correlations of the Profiles of Mean Importance Ratings

Education professionals. Correlations were computed among arrays of means for the teachers and college faculty in the primary and supplemental samples. The obtained correlations are provided in Table 3.

Demographic subgroups. Correlations were computed among arrays of means for the selected subgroups of respondents (e.g., males and females). This is done as a way of evaluating agreement among subgroups. The correlations between the various subgroups are provided in Table 4. Note that all values are above .95. This indicates a high level of agreement among subgroups and is consistent with findings in the job analysis literature (e.g., Schmitt and Cohen, 1989).

Table 3
Correlations of Mean Importance Ratings Among Education Professionals

	1	2	3	4
1. Teachers–Primary Sample (N=219)	1.00			
2. Teachers–Supplemental Sample (N=118)	.99	1.00		
3. College Faculty–Primary Sample (N=165)	.87	.86	1.00	
4. College Faculty–Supplemental Sample (N=64)	.88	.89	.92	1.00

Mean Ratings of Content Coverage

The survey participants were asked to indicate, using a 5-point rating scale, how well the statements within each of the four major knowledge categories covered the important aspects of the category. Responses to this provide an indication of the adequacy (comprehensiveness) of the content domain. The scale values were 1=Poorly, 2=Somewhat, 3=Adequately, 4=Well, 5=Very well. The mean ratings for the teachers and college faculty in the primary and supplemental samples and for all respondents in the total sample are presented in Table 5. The overall mean ratings (i.e., for all employment categories in the total sample) exceed 4.00 on all categories. This supports the notion that the major knowledge categories were reasonably well covered and that the overall content domain was comprehensive.

Table 4
Correlations of Mean Importance Ratings Among Demographic Subgroups

	1	2	3	4
Sex				
1. Female (N=516)	1.00			
2. Male (N=197)	.98	1.00		
Racial/Ethnic Background				
1. People of Color (N=141)	1.00			
2. White (N=568)	.96	1.00		
Geographic Region				
1. Northeast (N=168)	1.00			
2. Central (N=171)	.99	1.00		
3. South (N=187)	.99	.99	1.00	
4. Far West (N=173)	.98	.98	.98	1.00
Teaching Experience (teachers only)				
1. 1 - 5 years (N=41)	1.00			
2. Greater than 5 years (N=296)	.96	1.00		

Table 5
Mean Ratings of Content Coverage

	Primary Sample		Supplemental Sample		Total Sample
Knowledge Category	Teachers (N=219)	College Faculty (N=165)	Teachers (N=118)	College Faculty (N=64)	All Employment Categories (N=724)
Literature	4.23	3.82	4.26	4.29	4.13
Language/Linguistics	4.01	3.81	4.19	4.10	4.02
Rhetoric/Composition	4.51	4.16	4.60	4.57	4.43
Pedagogy Specific to English	4.40	4.30	4.49	4.63	4.41

Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis: Recommendations for Test Content

In Part III of the survey, Recommendations for Test Content, participants are asked to indicate how many test questions (out of 100) should be included from each of the knowledge categories. This information may be used by the Advisory Committee to assist them in making decisions about how much emphasis the knowledge categories should receive in the test specifications. The mean weights for the teachers and college faculty in the primary and supplemental samples and for all respondents in the total sample are presented in Table 6. *Literature* and *Rhetoric/Composition* received the highest average ratings, while *Language/Linguistics* received the lowest.

Table 6
Mean Percentage Weights for Test Content Emphasis

Knowledge Category	Primary Sample: Teachers (N = 219)	Primary Sample: College Faculty (N = 165)	Supplemental Sample: Teachers (N = 118)	Supplemental Sample: College Faculty (N = 64)	Total Sample: All Employment Categories (N = 724)
Literature	30.67	27.40	30.62	28.14	29.29
Language/Linguistics	18.44	18.98	19.72	19.03	19.29
Rhetoric/Composition	31.04	29.22	29.42	31.13	30.04
Pedagogy Specific to English	19.85	24.41	20.24	21.70	21.38

Summary and Conclusions

A job analysis was conducted to define a knowledge domain in which newly licensed (certified) English teachers must be knowledgeable to perform their jobs in a competent manner. A draft domain of important knowledge statements was constructed by ETS Test Development staff with expertise in English and ETS Research staff with expertise in job analysis. This draft domain was reviewed by an External Review Panel of subject-matter experts and revised as they felt necessary. The revised draft was then reviewed, modified, and approved by an external Advisory Committee. The revised knowledge domain was then subjected to verification/refutation through the use of a national survey of English teachers, teacher educators, and state administrators. The survey participants were asked to rate specific knowledge statements of the domain using a 5-point importance scale. A cut point of 2.50 (midpoint between moderately important and important) was established to designate knowledge statements as eligible (≥ 2.50) or ineligible (< 2.50) for inclusion in the development of test specifications.

The results of the mean analysis conducted by teachers and teacher educators indicated that 18 of 110 knowledge statements were rated less than 2.50. This represents 16.4% of the content domain. When the same analysis was conducted for demographic subgroups, very similar results were obtained. *In total, 19 of the 110 statements (17.3%) did not meet the 2.50 criterion for inclusion in these two analyses.*

The 91 knowledge statements that were verified to be important by those surveyed should be used as the foundation for the development of test specifications. Test specifications that are linked to the results of a job analysis provide support for the content validity of the derived assessment measures and may be considered part of an initial step in ensuring the fairness to subgroups of English teacher candidates of the derived assessment measures. It is reasonable to assume that because of testing and psychometric constraints (e.g., time limits, ability to measure some content reliably) not all of the verified content will be included in the new assessment measure. One source of information that may be used to guide the Advisory Committee in their decision as to what verified content to include is the mean importance rating. Although a rank ordering of the content by mean importance rating is not implied, it is recommended that initial

consideration be given to content that is well above the criterion and represents the appropriate breadth of content coverage as stipulated in the test specifications.

The computation of correlation coefficients to assess relative agreement in terms of perceived importance of the knowledge statements revealed a very high level of agreement. All coefficients exceeded .85. These findings indicate that *there is substantial agreement in the importance ratings given across a wide array of education professionals.*

Evidence was also provided in this study of the comprehensiveness of the content domain within each of the four major knowledge categories. The results indicated that the survey respondents thought the categories were reasonably well covered by their statements.

Finally, we collected data in the Recommendations for Test Content section of the survey regarding the emphasis that should be given in the test to each of the four categories. This information will be used by the Advisory Committee in their decisions about the appropriate weighting of the test.

In summary, this study took a multi-method approach to identify a content domain that is related to the job of the newly licensed English teacher. The job analysis process allowed for input from many practicing professionals in English education. The results of the study will be used to develop specifications for the English test that will be included as part of the subject assessments of The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™.

References

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education. (1985). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Arvey, R. D., & Faley, R. H. (1988). *Fairness in selecting employees*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, 42 U. S. C. § 2000e.

Gael, S. (1983). *Job analysis: A guide to assessing work activities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ghiselli, E. E., Campbell, J. P., & Zedeck, S. (1981). *Measurement theory for the behavioral sciences*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.

Grossman, P. L. (1989). A study in contrast: Sources of pedagogical content knowledge for secondary Mathematics. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40(5)*, 24-31.

Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Knowledge for teaching. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 193-205). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kuehn, P. A., Stallings, W. M., & Holland, C. L. (1990). Court-defined job analysis requirements for validation of teacher certification tests. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 9*, 21-24.

McDiarmid, G. W., Ball, D. L., & Anderson, C. W. (1989). Why staying one chapter ahead doesn't really work: Subject-specific pedagogy. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for the beginning teacher* (pp. 193-205). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Mehrens, W. A. (1987). Validity issues in teacher licensure tests. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*, 195-229.

Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 1-35.

Rosenfeld, M., & Tannenbaum, R. J. (1991). *Identification of a core of important enabling skills for the NTE Successor Stage I examination* (RR-91-37). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Schmitt, N., & Cohen, S. C. (1989). Internal analyses of task ratings by job incumbents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 96-104.

Walpole, R. E. (1974). *Introduction to statistics (2nd ed.)*. New York: Macmillan.

Appendix A

External Review Panel

Secondary School Teachers

Robert H. Egolf
Wm. Allen High School
17th & Turner Streets
Allentown, PA 18104

Rayna Goldfarb
34 Rosedale Road
Philadelphia, PA 19151

Marti L. Palmere
895 Bear Tavern Road
Trenton, NJ 08628

College Faculty

Gretchen M. Bataille
Department of English
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-0302

Edwin C. Carpenter
Division of Languages and Literature
Northeast Missouri State University
Kirksville, MO 63501

Lahana Diskin
Department of English
325 Holman Hall
Trenton State College
Hillwoods Lakes CN4700
Trenton, NJ 08650

Joan Hartman
Department of English
College of Staten Island, CUNY
Staten Island, NY 10301

Karen Houck
Department of English
Bellevue Community College
Bellevue, WA 98009-2037

Dennis Martin
Department of English
Pacific Lutheran University
Tacoma, WA 98447

Timothy Materer
Department of English
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211

Elihu Pearlman
Department of English
University of Colorado
Denver, CO 80640

Appendix B

Advisory Committee

Secondary School Teachers

Rayna Goldfarb
34 Rosedale Road
Philadelphia, PA 19151

Grace Lomba
7730 Allison Road
New Orleans, LA 70126

Michael Salvatore
56 Greenfield Drive
South Windsor, CT 06074

James Sims
485 Walhalla Road
Columbus, OH 43215

College Faculty

Janice Lauer
Department of English
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Karen Webb *
Department of English
Loche Hall 250
Howard University
Washington, DC 20054

* Karen Webb and Ellen Last were not members of the Advisory/Test Development committee during the first meeting. Hence, they had no input during the development of the job analysis inventory. They were present, however, during a second meeting in which the job analysis results were reviewed.

John O. White
CSU, Fullerton
800 N. State College Road
Fullerton, CA 92634

Denny T. Wolfe
College of Education
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA 23508

State Administrator

Ellen Last *
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Bureau for Program Development
Division of Instructional Services
125 South Webster Street
PO Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707

School Administrator

Claire Pelton
Department of Instruction
San Jose Unified School District
1605 Park Avenue
San Jose, CA 95126

* Karen Webb and Ellen Last were not members of the Advisory/Test Development committee during the first meeting. Hence, they had no input during the development of the job analysis inventory. They were present, however, during a second meeting in which the job analysis results were reviewed.

Appendix C

Job Analysis Inventory

JOB ANALYSIS INVENTORY

FOR TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

By

Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

Copyright © 1991 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Educational Testing Service (ETS) is developing a new generation of assessments for the purpose of licensing teachers. The inventory that follows is part of our development effort and is designed to gather information concerning the secondary-school English teacher's job. It was developed by high school teachers, college faculty, and state department of education officials, along with ETS staff.

Those who constructed this questionnaire recognize that English teachers are required to teach students with varying backgrounds and levels of ability. For these reasons, the collaborators believe that teachers should have a broad and deep understanding of English in order to teach it. The inventory asks you to respond to a list of task statements and to rate each statement as to its importance for a newly licensed (certified) English teacher. Please do not relate each task to your own job but rather to what you believe a new teacher should know and be able to do.

The information you provide will guide the development of the NTE English Language and Literature successor. It is expected that the new test will differ from the current examination in both content and design. In addition to the development of a new test, this study will also contribute to our understanding of English teaching as a profession. We expect the results of the study to be widely disseminated and to have ramifications for teacher preparation.

The inventory has been mailed to a group of approximately 800 professionals. Its value is directly related to the number of individuals who return their questionnaires. Because you represent a large number of professionals, your responses are extremely important. Please take the time to complete and return the questionnaire.

PART I -- INVENTORY OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The purpose of Part I is to ascertain what you believe a new English teacher should know and be able to do. On the following pages you will find four broad categories (i.e., LITERATURE, LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS, RHETORIC/COMPOSITION, and PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH). Beneath each category is a list of statements, written as tasks, related to that category. For each task in Part I, you will be asked to make your judgment as to the following:

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

To familiarize yourself with the categories and statements, you may wish to glance through Part I before making your rating judgments.

Following each category is a question concerning how well you think the important aspects of the category are covered by the statements in the inventory. On the lines provided, note any important areas that you feel are not covered.

IMPORTANCE: How <u>important</u> is it that a <u>newly licensed (certified) English teacher</u> be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

A. LITERATURE	IMPORTANCE
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the characteristics of different literary types (e.g., poems, plays, novels, essays, short stories)	0 1 2 3 4
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the characteristics of a wide variety of literary forms (e.g., sonnets, narratives, diaries, autobiographies, sermons)	0 1 2 3 4
3. Paraphrase a passage	0 1 2 3 4
4. Interpret a passage	0 1 2 3 4
5. Describe the writer's tone in a passage	0 1 2 3 4
6. Describe the mood of a passage	0 1 2 3 4
7. Identify and explain references and allusions in a passage	0 1 2 3 4
8. Identify figurative language in a passage	0 1 2 3 4
9. Distinguish between connotation and denotation	0 1 2 3 4
10. Locate a piece of literature in its historical period	0 1 2 3 4
11. Interpret literature within a cultural and historical context	0 1 2 3 4
12. Interpret metaphorical language	0 1 2 3 4
13. Compare works of literature	0 1 2 3 4
14. Identify the theme(s) of a work	0 1 2 3 4
15. Support statements and interpretations with relevant, specific citations and documentation	0 1 2 3 4
16. Interpret a work within its current cultural contexts	0 1 2 3 4
17. Identify meters and rhyme schemes	0 1 2 3 4
18. Recognize various critical approaches to reading and interpreting literature	0 1 2 3 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

A. LITERATURE (cont.)	IMPORTANCE
19. Demonstrate an understanding of poststructuralist literary theory	0 1 2 3 4
20. Demonstrate an understanding of film as literature	0 1 2 3 4
21. Identify the values reflected in a work of literature	0 1 2 3 4
Identify major works from the following categories, given brief literary passages or critical commentary:	
22. World literature	0 1 2 3 4
23. Classical literature	0 1 2 3 4
24. Comparative literature	0 1 2 3 4
25. English literature to 1660	0 1 2 3 4
26. English literature 1660-1925	0 1 2 3 4
27. American literature before 1925	0 1 2 3 4
28. British and American literature after 1925	0 1 2 3 4
(It is assumed that statements 29-32 will have dual classification with 33-38.)	
29. Adolescent literature	0 1 2 3 4
30. Ethnic literature	0 1 2 3 4
31. Women's literature	0 1 2 3 4
32. Literary theory	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

A. LITERATURE (cont.)

33. How well do the tasks in section A cover the important aspects of LITERATURE?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

B. LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS	IMPORTANCE
Demonstrate an understanding of the following:	
34. History of the English language	0 1 2 3 4
35. Theories of language acquisition and development	0 1 2 3 4
36. Inflection/morphology	0 1 2 3 4
37. Dialects	0 1 2 3 4
38. Phonology	0 1 2 3 4
39. Psycholinguistics	0 1 2 3 4
40. Semantics	0 1 2 3 4
41. Sociolinguistics	0 1 2 3 4
42. Syntax	0 1 2 3 4
43. Traditional grammar	0 1 2 3 4
44. Other grammatical theories	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

B. LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS (cont.)

45. How well do the tasks in section B cover the important aspects of LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

C. RHETORIC/COMPOSITION — IMPORTANCE

Statements in this category pertain to the individual as teacher of rhetoric and composition and to the teacher as writer.

46. Demonstrate an understanding of how students learn to write 0 1 2 3 4

47. Prewrite or explore (e.g., use brainstorming techniques, journals, questioning) 0 1 2 3 4

48. Provide and sustain a focus or thesis 0 1 2 3 4

49. Create texts for different audiences 0 1 2 3 4

50. Sustain an appropriate voice as a speaker and writer 0 1 2 3 4

51. Use different modes of organization 0 1 2 3 4

52. Create different types of discourse (e.g., expressive, persuasive, expository, literary) 0 1 2 3 4

53. Generate appropriate and sufficient support for a focus or thesis (e.g., arguments, examples, evidence) 0 1 2 3 4

54. Preserve coherence and cohesion in an extended piece of writing 0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

C. RHETORIC/COMPOSITION (cont.)	IMPORTANCE
55. Revise writing for readers	0 1 2 3 4
56. Collaborate in speaking and writing	0 1 2 3 4
57. Use word processing and other technologies in creating and developing texts	0 1 2 3 4
58. Adjust sentence structure and word choices to the purposes of expression	0 1 2 3 4
59. Use figurative language	0 1 2 3 4
60. Use standard English	0 1 2 3 4
61. Identify the major theme(s) of a passage	0 1 2 3 4
62. Distinguish among specific types of writing (e.g., expressive, expository, persuasive)	0 1 2 3 4
63. Describe means of developing a discourse (e.g., descriptions, examples, narratives, arguments, evidence)	0 1 2 3 4
64. Describe elements of style (e.g., sentence structure, word choice)	0 1 2 3 4
65. Describe modes of organization	0 1 2 3 4
66. Draw inferences and identify implied arguments	0 1 2 3 4
67. Analyze reasoning within a discourse	0 1 2 3 4
68. Use context to interpret meanings	0 1 2 3 4
69. Distinguish fact from opinion	0 1 2 3 4
70. Deconstruct texts, identifying gaps and incongruities	0 1 2 3 4
71. Identify the intended audience	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

C. RHETORIC/COMPOSITION (cont.) — IMPORTANCE

Identify figurative language:

72. Hyperbole and exaggeration 0 1 2 3 4
73. Irony 0 1 2 3 4
74. Metaphor 0 1 2 3 4
75. Personification 0 1 2 3 4
76. Simile 0 1 2 3 4
77. Understatement 0 1 2 3 4

78. Evaluate the sustaining of a focus or thesis 0 1 2 3 4
79. Assess the sufficiency and appropriateness of supporting material (examples, arguments) 0 1 2 3 4
80. Assess the coherence and cohesion of a discourse 0 1 2 3 4
81. Assess the effectiveness of word choices and sentence structure 0 1 2 3 4
82. Assess consistent and appropriate uses of standard English, including grammar, usage, spelling, and punctuation 0 1 2 3 4

83. How well do the tasks in section C cover the important aspects of RHETORIC/COMPOSITION?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

_____

_____

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

D. PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH *In addition to content, English teachers need to know pedagogy specific to English. This includes knowledge of students, curriculum, teaching strategies, and resources.*	IMPORTANCE
84. Determine the knowledge, experience, and skills that students bring to the English classroom	0 1 2 3 4
85. Teach grammar and usage by having students study their own language in context	0 1 2 3 4
86. Given an example of a student's work that contains an error arising from a misconception, identify the misconception and assist the student in correcting it	0 1 2 3 4
87. Recognize patterns of error in student work and assist students in developing strategies to correct them	0 1 2 3 4
88. Demonstrate an understanding of the relative impact of societal and cultural influences on the literacy education of differing gender, racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups	0 1 2 3 4
89. Demonstrate an understanding of bilingual and second language issues	0 1 2 3 4
90. Evaluate the organization of content in an English curriculum	0 1 2 3 4
91. Use the works of authors from diverse backgrounds in the instruction of literature	0 1 2 3 4
92. Organize a sequence of content and instruction in an English curriculum for a particular grade level or group of students	0 1 2 3 4
93. Provide a rationale for the study of English	0 1 2 3 4
94. Identify purposes for teaching particular topics in English	0 1 2 3 4
95. Demonstrate an understanding of the importance of learning theories to teaching English	0 1 2 3 4
96. Interrelate reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking in the classroom	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

D. PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH (cont.)	IMPORTANCE
97. Show relationships between English and other disciplines	0 1 2 3 4
98. Engage students' experience and knowledge outside of texts to teach English	0 1 2 3 4
99. Use curricular materials and resources for English (e.g., textbooks and other printed materials, computer software) in ways appropriate for particular groups of students and particular topics	0 1 2 3 4
100. Use instructional technologies (e.g., computer, videodisc, interactive television) to teach English	0 1 2 3 4
101. Use a variety of teaching strategies (e.g., laboratory work, supervised practice, group work, lecture) in English appropriate for particular groups of students and particular topics	0 1 2 3 4
102. Use modeling strategies to teach reading and writing	0 1 2 3 4
103. Demonstrate an understanding of the importance of collaborative learning	0 1 2 3 4
104. Demonstrate an understanding of the importance of using whole texts rather than workbooks in the English curriculum	0 1 2 3 4
105. Use appropriate forms of representation (e.g., analogies, examples, drawings, symbols) for teaching English	0 1 2 3 4
106. Use mass media (e.g., film, television, video) in teaching English	0 1 2 3 4
107. Use appropriate evaluation strategies (e.g., portfolios, observations, interviews, oral discussions, essays, written tests) to assess student performance	0 1 2 3 4
108. Develop questions that ask students to display their understanding of particular topics	0 1 2 3 4
109. Engage students in developing their own questions about topics in English	0 1 2 3 4

IMPORTANCE: How important is it that a newly licensed (certified) English teacher be able to perform this task in a competent manner?

0 Of no importance
1 Of little importance
2 Moderately important
3 Important
4 Very important

Circle your response using the scale adjacent to each task statement.

D. PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH (cont.)	IMPORTANCE
110. Know procedures for controlling the social atmosphere of a classroom without discouraging divergent thought	0 1 2 3 4
111. Demonstrate an awareness of professional and scholarly literature (e.g., journals, reference works) appropriate for English teachers and students	0 1 2 3 4
112. Demonstrate an awareness of professional and scholarly organizations for English teachers and students	0 1 2 3 4
113. Acknowledge the complexities of modern society and their impact on teaching and learning English	0 1 2 3 4

114. How well do the tasks in section D cover the important aspects of PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH?

1	2	3	4	5
Very Poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very Well

What important aspects, if any, are not covered?

PART II -- RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEST CONTENT

Here are the four general categories covered in the first section of this inventory. If a licensing examination for English teachers contained 100 questions, how many questions should be included from each category? If you feel a category should not be included in the exam, put 0 in the space provided. Make sure your responses total 100.

CATEGORIES	NUMBER OF TEST QUESTIONS (out of 100)
115. LITERATURE	_____
116. LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS	_____
117. RHETORIC/COMPOSITION	_____
118. PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH	_____
Total	100

PART III -- BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The information that you provide in this section is completely confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Please answer the questions by circling the number that most closely describes you or your professional activities. Unless otherwise indicated, please circle only one response for each question.

119. Where do you work?

1. Alabama
2. Alaska
3. Arizona
4. Arkansas
5. California
6. Colorado
7. Connecticut
8. Delaware
9. District of Columbia
10. Florida
11. Georgia
12. Hawaii
13. Idaho
14. Illinois
15. Indiana
16. Iowa
17. Kansas
18. Kentucky
19. Louisiana
20. Maine
21. Maryland
22. Massachusetts
23. Michigan
24. Minnesota
25. Mississippi
26. Missouri
27. Montana
28. Nebraska
29. Nevada
30. New Hampshire
31. New Jersey
32. New Mexico
33. New York
34. North Carolina
35. North Dakota
36. Ohio
37. Oklahoma
38. Oregon
39. Pennsylvania
40. Puerto Rico
41. Rhode Island
42. South Carolina
43. South Dakota
44. Tennessee
45. Texas
46. Utah
47. Vermont
48. Virginia
49. Washington
50. West Virginia
51. Wisconsin
52. Wyoming

120. What is your age?

1. Under 25
2. 25-34
3. 35-44
4. 45-54
5. 55-64
6. Over 64

121. What is your sex?

1. Female
2. Male

122. How do you describe yourself?

1. American Indian, Inuit, or Aleut
2. Asian, Asian American, Hawaiian Native, or Pacific Islander
3. Black or African American
4. Chicano or Mexican American
5. Puerto Rican
6. Latin American, South American, Central American, or other Hispanic
7. White
8. Other

123. Which of the following best describes your highest educational attainment?

1. Less than a bachelor's
2. Bachelor's
3. Bachelor's + additional credits
4. Master's
5. Master's + additional credits
6. Doctorate

124. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

1. Temporary substitute (assigned on a daily basis)
2. Permanent substitute (assigned on a longer term basis)
3. Regular teacher (not a substitute)
4. Principal or assistant principal
5. School administrator
6. Curriculum supervisor
7. State administrator
8. College faculty
9. Other (please specify)_____

125. How many years have you taught English?

1. Less than a year
2. 1 - 2 years
3. 3 - 5 years
4. 6 - 10 years
5. 11 - 15 years
6. 16 - 20 years
7. 21 or more years
8. Never taught English

126. What grade level(s) are you currently teaching? (Circle all that apply)

1. Preschool/kindergarten
2. Grades 1-4
3. Grades 5-8
4. Grades 9-12
5. College
6. Do not currently teach (supervisor/administrator)
7. Do not currently teach (retired)
8. Other (please specify)_____

127. Which of the following are included in your current teaching assignment? (Circle all that apply)

1. Composition
2. Advanced Placement
3. Honors
4. Remedial English
5. English as a Second Language
6. Dramatic Productions
7. Journalism
8. Survey course in American Literature
9. Survey course in English Literature
10. Course in World Literature
11. Do not currently teach
12. Other (please specify)_____

128. Circle the following organizations to which you belong.

1. American Federation of Teachers
2. Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language
3. Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC)
4. Conference on English Education
5. Modern Language Association
6. National Council of Teachers of English
7. National Education Association
8. Other (please specify)_____

Thank you for completing this inventory.

Please return it within two weeks using the enclosed envelope.

Appendix D

Cover Letter and Follow-Up Postcard

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PRINCETON, N.J. 08541

609-921-9000
CABLE-EDUCTESTSVC

DIVISION OF COGNITIVE
AND ASSESSMENT RESEARCH

May 1990

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to ask your cooperation in a project that should be of importance to teachers, college faculty, administrators, and other professionals in your field. Educational Testing Service (ETS) is in the process of developing a new generation of assessments for the purpose of licensing teachers. One type of assessment will be created to measure the prospective teacher's subject-matter or specialty-area knowledge and will likely be administered upon completion of the undergraduate teacher education program. One such assessment is a new version of the NTE English Language and Literature test. I am asking for your help as we develop this examination.

As part of the developmental process, ETS has worked closely with an advisory committee of classroom teachers, college faculty, and school administrators to identify potentially important knowledge and skill areas in English instruction. The enclosed inventory has been constructed as a way to obtain your judgments on the importance of these areas for the newly licensed (certified) English teacher. Your responses and those of other professionals to this inventory will guide the development of the new examination.

You will notice that the inventory asks for some background information about you; this is solely for purposes of describing respondents. Your answers will be treated in strict confidence.

A postage-paid envelope is enclosed for the return of your completed questionnaire. Thank you for your participation in this important project.

Sincerely,

Scott Wesley

Scott Wesley, Ph.D.
Associate Research Scientist

Enc. (2)

JOB ANALYSIS INVENTORY FOR TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

Dear Colleague:

I recently sent you an inventory to obtain your opinions of what a newly-licensed English teacher should know and be able to do. If you have not already done so, please complete the inventory and return it in the postage-paid envelope to:

Educational Testing Service
Mail Stop 11-P
Princeton, NJ 08541

If you have already returned the inventory, please accept my thanks for your help in this important project.

Sincerely, Scott Wesley

Scott Wesley, Ph.D.
Associate Research Scientist
Educational Testing Service

Appendix E

Demographic Distributions

	Primary Sample (N = 507)		Supplemental Sample (N = 217)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
AGE (years)				
Under 25	0	0.0	2	0.9
25-34	22	4.3	28	12.9
35-44	169	33.3	70	32.3
45-54	182	35.9	66	30.4
55-64	87	17.2	35	16.1
65 and over	38	7.5	13	6.0
No response	9	7.8	3	1.4
SEX				
Female	356	70.2	160	73.7
Male	142	28.0	55	25.3
No response	9	1.8	2	0.9
RACE/ETHNICITY				
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0.0	1	0.5
Asian, Asian American, Hawaiian Native, or Pacific Islander	7	1.4	3	1.4
Black or African American	17	3.4	95	43.8
Hispanic	1	0.2	9	4.2
White	468	92.3	100	46.1
Other	4	0.8	4	1.8
No response	10	2.0	5	2.3
HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
Less than Bachelor's	0	0.0	0	0.0
Bachelor's	2	0.4	7	3.2
Bachelor's + Credits	41	8.1	46	21.2
Master's	39	7.7	15	6.9
Master's + Credits	249	49.1	72	33.2
Doctorate	168	33.1	74	34.1
No response	8	1.6	3	1.4

	Primary Sample (N = 507)		Supplemental Sample (N = 217)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Temporary Substitute	4	0.8	0	0.0
Permanent Substitute	2	0.4	0	0.0
Regular Teacher (not a substitute)	217	42.8	118	54.4
Principal or Assistant Principal	3	0.6	3	1.4
School Administrator	6	1.2	3	1.4
Curricular Supervisor	17	3.4	5	2.3
State Administrator	2	0.4	0	0.0
College or University Faculty	165	32.5	64	29.5
Other	50	9.9	19	8.8
No response	41	8.1	5	2.3
TEACHING EXPERIENCE				
Less than 1 year	0	0.0	0	0.0
1-2 years	2	0.4	14	6.5
3-5 years	7	1.4	26	12.0
6-10 years	32	6.3	18	8.3
11-15 years	82	16.2	29	13.4
16-20 years	136	26.8	47	21.7
21 or more years	239	47.1	80	36.9
Never taught English	1	0.2	0	0.0
No response	8	1.6	3	1.4
GRADES CURRENTLY TEACHING [1]				
Preschool/Kindergarten	3	0.6	0	0.0
Grades 1 - 4	3	0.6	0	0.0
Grades 5 - 8	48	9.5	10	4.6
Grades 9 - 12	232	45.8	121	55.8
College	203	40.0	73	33.6
Do not teach (supervisor/administrator)	25	4.9	17	7.8
Do not teach (retired)	27	5.3	7	3.2
Other	30	5.9	10	4.6

[1] Multiple responses were allowed. Total will not add up to 507 in the main sample and 217 in the supplementary sample.

	Primary Sample (N = 507)		Supplemental Sample (N = 217)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CURRENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT [1]				
Composition	381	75.1	158	72.8
Advanced Placement	75	14.8	27	12.4
Honors	141	27.8	57	26.3
Remedial English	131	25.8	81	37.3
English as a Second Language	37	7.3	18	8.3
Dramatic Productions	33	6.5	20	9.2
Journalism	39	7.7	15	6.9
Survey Course in American Literature	140	27.6	77	35.5
Survey Course in English Literature	113	22.3	49	22.6
Course in World Literature	93	18.3	59	27.2
Do not currently teach	48	9.5	17	7.8
Other	167	32.9	82	37.8
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS [1]				
American Federation of Teachers (AFT)	35	6.9	25	11.5
Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language (ATESL)	14	2.8	4	1.8
Conference of College Composition and Communication (CCCC)	151	29.8	64	29.5
Conference of English Education (CEE)	59	11.6	20	9.2
Modern Language Association (MLA)	85	16.8	39	18.0
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)	489	96.4	158	72.8
National Education Association	209	41.2	76	35.0
Other	166	32.7	91	41.9
GEOGRAPHIC REGION				
Northeast	113	22.3	55	25.3
Central	122	24.1	49	22.6
South	129	25.4	58	26.7
Far West	121	23.9	52	24.0
No response	22	4.3	3	1.4

[1] Multiple responses were allowed. Total will not add up to 507 in the main sample and 217 in the supplementary sample.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F

Importance Ratings for Primary and Supplemental Samples

		Primary Sample		Supplemental Sample	
		Teachers (N=219)	College Faculty (N=165)	Teachers (N=118)	College Faculty (N=64)
LITERATURE					
1	Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of different literary types	3.81	3.54	3.69	3.64
2	Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of variety of literary forms	3.46	3.16	3.36	3.36
3	Paraphrase a passage	3.59	3.50	3.52	3.45
4	Interpret a passage	3.76	3.63	3.73	3.64
5	Describe the writer's tone in a passage	3.33	3.15	3.21	3.22
6	Describe the mood of a passage	3.29	2.98	3.20	3.08
7	Identify and explain references and allusions in a passage	3.22	2.85	3.15	3.19
8	Identify figurative language in a passage	3.47	3.07	3.40	3.25
9	Distinguish between connotation and denotation	3.43	3.25	3.20	3.48
10	Locate a piece of literature in its historical period	2.93	2.80	2.85	3.05
11	Interpret literature within a cultural and historical context	3.11	3.21	3.10	3.31
12	Interpret metaphorical language	3.37	3.24	3.15	3.14
13	Compare works of literature	3.24	3.07	3.24	3.28
14	Identify the theme(s) of a work	3.68	3.44	3.57	3.39
15	Support statements and interpretations with citations and documentation	3.32	3.33	3.20	3.33
16	Interpret a work within its current cultural contexts	3.02	3.19	3.05	3.39
17	Identify meters and rhyme schemes	2.42	2.09	2.26	2.31
18	Recognize various critical approaches to reading/interpreting literature	2.71	2.78	2.54	2.86
19	Demonstrate understanding of poststructuralist literary theory	1.41	1.78	1.55	1.86
20	Demonstrate understanding of film as literature	2.31	2.35	2.44	2.43
21	Identify the values reflected in a work of literature	3.33	3.30	3.33	3.37
Identify major works from the following categories, given brief literary passages or critical commentary:					
22	World literature	2.55	2.47	2.54	2.92
23	Classical literature	2.71	2.42	2.67	2.76
24	Comparative literature	2.35	2.12	2.43	2.44
25	English literature to 1660	2.49	2.35	2.49	2.59
26	English literature 1660-1925	2.66	2.56	2.63	2.75
27	American literature before 1925	2.75	2.62	2.71	2.90
28	British and American literature after 1925	2.81	2.79	2.90	3.05
29	Adolescent literature	2.47	2.43	2.49	2.73
30	Ethnic literature	2.54	2.56	2.56	3.25
31	Women's literature	2.47	2.50	2.53	3.11
32	Literary theory	2.18	2.01	2.17	2.51

Note: Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

		Primary Sample		Supplemental Sample	
		Teachers (N = 219)	College Faculty (N = 165)	Teachers (N = 118)	College Faculty (N = 64)
LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS					
	Demonstrate an understanding of the following:				
34	History of the English language	2.48	2.71	2.30	2.83
35	Theories of language acquisition and development	2.12	2.91	2.07	2.84
36	Inflection/morphology	1.86	2.00	1.82	2.39
37	Dialects	2.14	2.67	2.14	2.97
38	Phonology	1.88	1.87	1.87	2.51
39	Psycholinguistics	1.63	2.25	1.70	2.49
40	Semantics	2.55	2.55	2.55	2.79
41	Sociolinguistics	1.93	2.60	2.04	3.02
42	Syntax	3.03	2.95	2.84	3.16
43	Traditional grammar	3.18	2.79	3.26	3.35
44	Other grammatical theories	2.25	2.44	2.38	2.62
RHETORIC/COMPOSITION					
	Statements in this category pertain to the individual as teacher of rhetoric and composition and to the teacher as writer.				
46	Demonstrate understanding of how students learn to write	3.66	3.71	3.53	3.56
47	Prewrite or explore (e.g., use brainstorming techniques, journals, questioning)	3.73	3.69	3.69	3.53
48	Provide and sustain a focus or thesis	3.77	3.69	3.69	3.81
49	Create texts for different audiences	3.42	3.52	3.20	3.52
50	Sustain an appropriate voice as a speaker and writer	3.47	3.48	3.42	3.55
51	Use different modes of organization	3.50	3.29	3.53	3.70
52	Create different types of discourse (e.g., expressive, persuasive, expository, literary)	3.62	3.38	3.67	3.61
53	Generate appropriate and sufficient support for a focus or thesis	3.81	3.67	3.79	3.95
54	Preserve coherence and cohesion in an extended piece of writing	3.76	3.56	3.72	3.91
55	Revise writing for readers	3.63	3.66	3.49	3.67
56	Collaborate in speaking and writing	3.20	3.26	3.20	3.41
57	Use word processing and other technologies to create/develop texts	2.92	2.69	2.72	2.61
58	Adjust sentence structure/word choices to the purposes of expression	3.51	3.38	3.45	3.52
59	Use figurative language	3.10	2.57	3.03	3.02
60	Use standard English	3.82	3.61	3.79	3.67
61	Identify the major theme(s) of a passage	3.59	3.24	3.58	3.55
62	Distinguish among types of writing (e.g., expressive, persuasive)	3.47	2.81	3.50	3.45
63	Describe means of developing a discourse (e.g., descriptions, examples)	3.43	3.04	3.53	3.63
64	Describe elements of style (e.g., sentence structure, word choice)	3.41	3.03	3.27	3.44
65	Describe modes of organization	3.29	2.85	3.28	3.48

		Primary Sample		Supplemental Sample	
		Teachers (N = 219)	College Faculty (N = 165)	Teachers (N = 118)	College Faculty (N = 64)
66	Draw inferences and identify implied arguments	3.44	3.35	3.32	3.56
67	Analyze reasoning within a discourse	3.35	3.33	3.27	3.55
68	Use context to interpret meanings	3.59	3.48	3.54	3.67
69	Distinguish fact from opinion	3.82	3.54	3.73	3.77
70	Deconstruct texts, identifying gaps and incongruities	2.93	2.64	2.94	3.00
71	Identify the intended audience	3.33	3.19	3.35	3.42
	Identify figurative language:				
72	Hyperbole and exaggeration	3.26	2.68	3.18	3.03
73	Irony	3.48	3.02	3.44	3.32
74	Metaphor	3.46	2.95	3.44	3.35
75	Personification	3.41	2.74	3.38	3.17
76	Simile	3.44	2.81	3.42	3.32
77	Understatement	3.27	2.76	3.21	3.14
78	Evaluate the sustaining of a focus or thesis	3.53	3.48	3.58	3.87
79	Assess the sufficiency and appropriateness of supporting material	3.62	3.60	3.50	3.84
80	Assess the coherence and cohesion of a discourse	3.50	3.42	3.49	3.75
81	Assess effectiveness of word choices and sentence structure	3.55	3.41	3.45	3.63
82	Assess consistent/appropriate uses of standard English (grammar, usage, spelling)	3.72	3.51	3.78	3.77
PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH					
84	Determine knowledge, experience, and skills that students bring to the English classroom	3.36	3.57	3.53	3.65
85	Teach grammar and usage by having students study their own language in context	3.13	3.32	3.03	3.38
86	Identify misconceptions and assist student in correcting	3.51	3.43	3.53	3.54
87	Recognize patterns of error and assist students in developing strategies to correct them	3.68	3.70	3.73	3.83
88	Demonstrate understanding of societal and cultural influences on literacy education	2.90	3.36	3.03	3.58
89	Demonstrate understanding of bilingual and second language issues	2.53	3.04	2.61	3.10
90	Evaluate the organization of content in an English curriculum	2.96	3.02	2.98	3.16
91	Use works of authors from diverse backgrounds in literature instruction	3.30	3.39	3.36	3.89
92	Organize sequence of content and instruction in an English curriculum	3.27	3.30	3.24	3.40
93	Provide a rationale for the study of English	3.11	3.10	3.18	3.15
94	Identify purposes for teaching particular topics in English	3.24	3.22	3.32	3.32
95	Demonstrate understanding of the importance of learning theories to teaching English	2.75	2.94	2.63	2.76
96	Interrelate reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking in the classroom	3.76	3.75	3.76	3.81

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		Primary Sample		Supplemental Sample	
		Teachers (N = 219)	College Faculty (N = 165)	Teachers (N = 118)	College Faculty (N = 64)
97	Show relationships between English and other disciplines	3.26	3.02	3.33	3.29
98	Engage students' experience and knowledge outside of texts to teach English	3.46	3.50	3.50	3.60
99	Use curricular materials and resources for English	3.47	3.32	3.54	3.41
100	Use instructional technologies (e.g, computer, videodisc, interactive TV)	2.89	2.61	3.04	2.81
101	Use a variety of teaching strategies (e.g., laboratory, supervised practice, group work)	3.61	3.53	3.54	3.63
102	Use modeling strategies to teach reading and writing	3.43	3.20	3.32	3.27
103	Demonstrate understanding of the importance of collaborative learning	3.15	3.13	3.13	3.27
104	Demonstrate understanding of the importance of using whole texts rather than workbooks	3.07	3.38	2.89	3.35
105	Use appropriate forms of representation (e.g., analogies, examples, drawings, symbols)	3.24	3.10	3.29	3.35
106	Use mass media (e.g., film, TV, video) in teaching English	2.80	2.65	3.01	3.06
107	Use appropriate evaluation strategies (e.g., portfolios, observations, essays, written tests)	3.57	3.71	3.53	3.75
108	Develop questions that ask students to display their understanding of particular topics	3.70	3.43	3.66	3.62
109	Engage students to develop their own questions about topics in English	3.38	3.49	3.25	3.57
110	Control social atmosphere of classroom without discouraging divergent thought	3.69	3.58	3.68	3.63
111	Demonstrate awareness of professional/scholarly literature	2.88	3.13	2.85	3.31
112	Demonstrate awareness of professional/scholarly organizations for teachers and students	2.79	2.95	2.68	3.17
113	Acknowledge complexities of society and their impact on teaching and learning English	3.10	3.14	3.19	3.48

Appendix G

Importance Ratings for Demographic Subgroups

	Sex		Race/ Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Teaching Experience (teachers only)	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	< 5	6+
LITERATURE										
1 Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of different literary types	3.73	3.60	3.68	3.70	3.68	3.74	3.71	3.65	3.60	3.79
2 Demonstrate understanding of characteristics of variety of literary forms	3.43	3.21	3.46	3.35	3.39	3.42	3.37	3.30	3.25	3.45
3 Paraphrase a passage	3.60	3.45	3.50	3.57	3.47	3.59	3.69	3.47	3.39	3.59
4 Interpret a passage	3.75	3.66	3.73	3.72	3.65	3.75	3.83	3.65	3.73	3.75
5 Describe the writer's tone in a passage	3.29	3.16	3.28	3.25	3.26	3.31	3.29	3.17	3.12	3.31
6 Describe the mood of a passage	3.22	3.08	3.21	3.17	3.17	3.24	3.25	3.08	3.12	3.26
7 Identify and explain references and allusions in a passage	3.14	3.05	3.26	3.08	3.07	3.20	3.16	3.06	3.07	3.21
8 Identify figurative language in a passage	3.37	3.24	3.37	3.32	3.35	3.41	3.33	3.28	3.33	3.46
9 Distinguish between connotation and denotation	3.40	3.22	3.50	3.32	3.46	3.36	3.37	3.23	2.95	3.40
10 Locate a piece of literature in its historical period	2.93	2.90	3.12	2.87	2.98	2.91	2.95	2.82	2.72	2.93
11 Interpret literature within a cultural and historical context	3.21	3.10	3.39	3.13	3.26	3.18	3.12	3.16	3.10	3.11
12 Interpret metaphorical language	3.28	3.25	3.24	3.26	3.23	3.32	3.28	3.26	3.02	3.33
13 Compare works of literature	3.22	3.15	3.31	3.18	3.20	3.22	3.15	3.20	3.37	3.22
14 Identify the theme(s) of a work	3.59	3.60	3.50	3.59	3.52	3.57	3.59	3.58	3.51	3.66
15 Support statements and interpretations with citations and documentation	3.31	3.37	3.39	3.31	3.24	3.38	3.34	3.37	3.29	3.28
16 Interpret a work within its current cultural contexts	3.13	3.13	3.41	3.06	3.23	3.04	3.16	3.06	2.98	3.04
17 Identify meters and rhyme schemes	2.36	2.27	2.39	2.32	2.36	2.32	2.40	2.26	2.17	2.39
18 Recognize various critical approaches to reading/interpreting literature	2.73	2.78	2.69	2.70	2.69	2.77	2.67	2.68	2.75	2.68
19 Demonstrate understanding of poststructuralist literary theory	1.61	1.65	1.84	1.57	1.58	1.69	1.57	1.67	1.84	1.46
20 Demonstrate understanding of film as literature	2.38	2.32	2.49	2.33	2.47	2.35	2.29	2.39	2.36	2.36
21 Identify the values reflected in a work of literature	3.32	3.35	3.38	3.32	3.33	3.27	3.36	3.33	3.23	3.34

Note: F = Female (N=516); M = Male (N=197); POC = People of Color (N=141); W = White (N=568); NE = Northeast (N=168); C = Central (N=171); S = South (N=187); FW = Far West (N=173); 0-5 = 0 to 5 years teaching experience (N=41); 6+ = 6 or more years teaching experience (N=296). Mean ratings that are less than 2.50 are shaded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Sex		Race/ Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Teaching Experience (teachers only)	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	< 5	6+
Identify major works from the following categories, given brief literary passages or critical commentary:										
22 World literature	2.57	2.62	2.87	2.52	2.57	2.59	2.67	2.51	2.73	2.52
23 Classical literature	2.62	2.68	2.88	2.59	2.58	2.69	2.71	2.59	2.80	2.68
24 Comparative literature	2.34	2.35	2.62	2.28	2.37	2.36	2.34	2.33	2.56	2.30
25 English literature to 1660	2.47	2.57	2.68	2.48	2.43	2.57	2.64	2.32	2.59	2.47
26 English literature 1660-1925	2.66	2.74	2.82	2.66	2.64	2.71	2.82	2.54	2.78	2.63
27 American literature before 1925	2.75	2.83	2.94	2.74	2.67	2.83	2.92	2.64	2.78	2.73
28 British and American literature after 1925	2.88	2.94	3.07	2.87	2.88	2.91	3.00	2.78	3.02	2.82
29 Adolescent literature	2.56	2.46	2.76	2.48	2.59	2.55	2.56	2.46	2.68	2.46
30 Ethnic literature	2.69	2.58	3.12	2.55	2.74	2.66	2.67	2.57	2.71	2.62
31 Women's literature	2.61	2.52	3.01	2.49	2.69	2.56	2.58	2.52	2.71	2.49
32 Literary theory	2.02	2.13	2.50	2.12	2.16	2.26	2.16	2.16	2.04	2.16
LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS										
Demonstrate an understanding of the following:										
34 History of the English language	2.52	2.74	2.79	2.54	2.47	2.63	2.75	2.46	2.33	2.44
35 Theories of language acquisition and development	2.37	2.67	2.60	2.39	2.40	2.46	2.50	2.46	2.40	2.40
36 Inflection/morphology	1.96	2.18	2.46	1.91	2.00	2.06	2.12	1.87	1.70	1.99
37 Dialects	2.36	2.40	2.84	2.27	2.36	2.49	2.43	2.36	2.60	2.12
38 Phonology	1.98	1.99	2.47	1.86	1.98	2.01	2.08	1.86	1.80	1.86
39 Psycholinguistics	1.93	1.99	2.38	1.85	1.96	2.02	1.90	1.94	1.78	1.94
40 Semantics	2.60	2.62	2.92	2.53	2.61	2.75	2.66	2.41	2.46	2.56
41 Sociolinguistics	2.24	2.42	2.81	2.16	2.31	2.36	2.22	2.36	2.05	1.96
42 Syntax	3.00	3.05	3.17	2.97	3.03	2.98	3.15	2.87	2.83	3.03
43 Traditional grammar	3.17	2.96	3.32	3.06	3.18	3.08	3.23	2.97	3.06	3.23
44 Other grammatical theories	2.38	2.43	2.68	2.32	2.41	2.42	2.36	2.37	2.33	2.29

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		Sex		Race/ Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Teaching Experience (teachers only)	
		F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	< 5	6+
RHETORIC/COMPOSITION											
	Statements in this category pertain to the individual as teacher of rhetoric and composition and to the teacher as writer.										
46	Demonstrate understanding of how students learn to write	3.66	3.61	3.59	3.66	3.59	3.57	3.67	3.67	3.46	3.64
47	Prewrite or explore (e.g., use brainstorming techniques, journals, questioning)	3.73	3.55	3.62	3.70	3.65	3.69	3.66	3.73	3.68	3.72
48	Provide and sustain a focus or thesis	3.78	3.62	3.70	3.75	3.65	3.74	3.78	3.75	3.73	3.75
49	Create texts for different audiences	3.45	3.33	3.49	3.40	3.37	3.42	3.42	3.47	3.22	3.36
50	Sustain an appropriate voice as a speaker and writer	3.53	3.37	3.56	3.47	3.46	3.52	3.48	3.49	3.46	3.45
51	Use different modes of organization	3.55	3.31	3.67	3.42	3.44	3.50	3.46	3.53	3.51	3.51
52	Create different types of discourse (e.g., expressive, persuasive, expository, literary)	3.60	3.42	3.63	3.52	3.46	3.56	3.59	3.60	3.68	3.63
53	Generate appropriate and sufficient support for a focus or thesis	3.80	3.71	3.86	3.76	3.80	3.84	3.77	3.72	3.85	3.79
54	Preserve coherence and cohesion in an extended piece of writing	3.76	3.62	3.86	3.69	3.72	3.75	3.78	3.66	3.68	3.75
55	Revise writing for readers	3.61	3.63	3.63	3.62	3.60	3.66	3.60	3.63	3.63	3.57
56	Collaborate in speaking and writing	3.25	3.23	3.45	3.19	3.29	3.20	3.24	3.30	3.30	3.18
57	Use word processing and other technologies to create/develop texts	2.75	2.86	2.77	2.79	2.73	2.84	2.74	2.82	2.95	2.83
58	Adjust sentence structure/word choices to the purposes of expression	3.51	3.37	3.57	3.45	3.42	3.56	3.47	3.44	3.33	3.51
59	Use figurative language	2.98	2.88	3.09	2.92	2.93	3.03	2.93	2.93	3.05	3.06
60	Use standard English	3.80	3.64	3.77	3.75	3.79	3.73	3.77	3.73	3.73	3.83
61	Identify the major theme(s) of a passage	3.57	3.32	3.61	3.47	3.51	3.51	3.52	3.49	3.68	3.57
62	Distinguish among types of writing (e.g., expressive, persuasive)	3.40	3.05	3.50	3.25	3.27	3.35	3.33	3.25	3.49	3.48
63	Describe means of developing a discourse (e.g., descriptions, examples)	3.44	3.25	3.65	3.33	3.36	3.49	3.38	3.33	3.41	3.47
64	Describe elements of style (e.g., sentence structure, word choice)	3.38	3.16	3.49	3.28	3.23	3.43	3.39	3.23	3.15	3.39
65	Describe modes of organization	3.28	3.06	3.50	3.15	3.18	3.26	3.23	3.19	3.15	3.31
66	Draw inferences and identify implied arguments	3.46	3.30	3.50	3.39	3.41	3.45	3.47	3.35	3.15	3.43
67	Analyze reasoning within a discourse	3.40	3.27	3.49	3.34	3.31	3.43	3.43	3.32	3.28	3.33
68	Use context to interpret meanings	3.59	3.48	3.66	3.53	3.55	3.56	3.64	3.52	3.34	3.61
69	Distinguish fact from opinion	3.78	3.61	3.78	3.72	3.71	3.75	3.78	3.70	3.65	3.81

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Sex		Race/ Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Teaching Experience (teachers only)	
	F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	< 5	6+
70 Deconstruct texts, identifying gaps and incongruities	2.95	2.69	2.99	2.86	2.73	3.08	2.86	2.86	2.88	2.94
71 Identify the intended audience	3.37	3.18	3.49	3.27	3.30	3.31	3.34	3.33	3.25	3.35
Identify figurative language:										
72 Hyperbole and exaggeration	3.15	2.91	3.20	3.05	3.07	3.12	3.14	3.02	3.08	3.25
73 Irony	3.37	3.28	3.39	3.33	3.37	3.32	3.41	3.29	3.33	3.49
74 Metaphor	3.35	3.25	3.43	3.29	3.32	3.34	3.37	3.27	3.33	3.47
75 Personification	3.27	3.04	3.32	3.17	3.17	3.26	3.27	3.17	3.25	3.42
76 Simile	3.32	3.14	3.42	3.22	3.29	3.29	3.34	3.19	3.30	3.45
77 Understatement	3.18	2.95	3.23	3.08	3.11	3.20	3.17	3.02	3.15	3.26
78 Evaluate the sustaining of a focus or thesis	3.60	3.47	3.74	3.53	3.59	3.58	3.55	3.54	3.58	3.55
79 Assess the sufficiency and appropriateness of supporting material	3.64	3.56	3.73	3.59	3.64	3.66	3.56	3.64	3.43	3.60
80 Assess the coherence and cohesion of a discourse	3.57	3.37	3.71	3.47	3.49	3.58	3.53	3.47	3.43	3.51
81 Assess effectiveness of word choices and sentence structure	3.58	3.38	3.67	3.49	3.50	3.54	3.53	3.53	3.41	3.53
82 Assess consistent/appropriate uses of standard English (grammar, usage, spelling)	3.73	3.57	3.79	3.65	3.71	3.70	3.67	3.64	3.67	3.75
PEDAGOGY SPECIFIC TO ENGLISH										
84 Determine knowledge, experience, and skills that students bring to the English classroom	3.53	3.45	3.66	3.46	3.52	3.53	3.49	3.49	3.45	3.41
85 Teach grammar and usage by having students study their own language in context	3.25	3.18	3.35	3.20	3.20	3.26	3.30	3.16	3.07	3.10
86 Identify misconceptions and assist student in correcting	3.54	3.39	3.62	3.48	3.47	3.59	3.57	3.39	3.48	3.52
87 Recognize patterns of error and assist students in developing strategies to correct them	3.74	3.62	3.83	3.68	3.68	3.75	3.75	3.67	3.75	3.69
88 Demonstrate understanding of societal and cultural influences on literacy education	3.16	3.10	3.52	3.05	3.13	3.20	3.13	3.11	3.08	2.93
89 Demonstrate understanding of bilingual and second language issues	2.81	2.71	3.15	2.69	2.77	2.81	2.71	2.88	2.83	2.52
90 Evaluate the organization of content in an English curriculum	3.04	2.95	3.23	2.96	2.94	3.05	3.04	3.01	2.98	2.97
91 Use works of authors from diverse backgrounds in literature instruction	3.43	3.30	3.77	3.30	3.39	3.44	3.38	3.36	3.33	3.32
92 Organize sequence of content and instruction in an English curriculum	3.27	3.25	3.38	3.24	3.17	3.30	3.28	3.33	3.30	3.25
93 Provide a rationale for the study of English	3.13	3.23	3.26	3.14	3.06	3.09	3.25	3.22	3.29	3.11
94 Identify purposes for teaching particular topics in English	3.26	3.29	3.40	3.24	3.25	3.27	3.29	3.29	3.36	3.26

		Sex		Race/ Ethnicity		Geographic Region				Teaching Experience (teachers only)	
		F	M	POC	W	NE	C	S	FW	< 5	6+
95	Demonstrate understanding of the importance of learning theories to teaching English	2.79	2.82	2.83	2.79	2.80	2.86	2.77	2.79	2.78	2.70
96	Interrelate reading, writing, speaking, listening, and thinking in the classroom	3.79	3.64	3.86	3.72	3.81	3.76	3.73	3.73	3.73	3.77
97	Show relationships between English and other disciplines	3.29	3.12	3.39	3.20	3.29	3.21	3.28	3.23	3.41	3.27
98	Engage students' experience and knowledge outside of texts to teach English	3.53	3.45	3.61	3.47	3.50	3.45	3.55	3.55	3.63	3.46
99	Use curricular materials and resources for English	3.48	3.33	3.56	3.41	3.44	3.42	3.43	3.45	3.50	3.49
100	Use instructional technologies (e.g, computer, videodisc, interactive TV)	2.84	2.84	3.02	2.78	2.77	2.93	2.82	2.85	3.20	2.91
101	Use a variety of teaching strategies (e.g., laboratory, supervised practice, group work)	3.61	3.49	3.66	3.55	3.55	3.60	3.58	3.58	3.65	3.57
102	Use modeling strategies to teach reading and writing	3.37	3.26	3.38	3.33	3.31	3.34	3.31	3.43	3.45	3.38
103	Demonstrate understanding of the importance of collaborative learning	3.19	3.08	3.35	3.11	3.16	3.13	3.10	3.30	3.24	3.13
104	Demonstrate understanding of the importance of using whole texts rather than workbooks	3.21	3.16	3.22	3.19	3.19	3.15	3.17	3.29	2.85	3.03
105	Use appropriate forms of representation (e.g., analogies, examples, drawings, symbols)	3.27	3.16	3.39	3.20	3.26	3.30	3.22	3.21	3.20	3.27
106	Use mass media (e.g., film, TV, video) in teaching English	2.87	2.70	3.15	2.74	2.82	2.86	2.79	2.82	3.05	2.85
107	Use appropriate evaluation strategies (e.g., portfolios, observations, essays, written tests)	3.65	3.54	3.78	3.59	3.69	3.58	3.58	3.64	3.51	3.56
108	Develop questions that ask students to display their understanding of particular topics	3.64	3.51	3.71	3.58	3.63	3.58	3.60	3.64	3.75	3.68
109	Engage students to develop their own questions about topics in English	3.45	3.35	3.58	3.38	3.45	3.41	3.43	3.45	3.31	3.34
110	Control social atmosphere of classroom without discouraging divergent thought	3.70	3.56	3.68	3.65	3.68	3.69	3.62	3.66	3.68	3.69
111	Demonstrate awareness of professional/scholarly literature	2.98	3.12	3.24	2.97	3.01	3.07	3.02	3.01	2.88	2.87
112	Demonstrate awareness of professional/scholarly organizations for teachers and students	2.87	2.89	3.16	2.80	2.83	2.91	2.85	2.93	2.73	2.75
113	Acknowledge complexities of society and their impact on teaching and learning English	3.20	3.15	3.45	3.11	3.16	3.22	3.21	3.18	3.12	3.13

51062-09448 • Y53M3 • 291149